



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,613	10/28/2003	Lillian R. Paolino	P/113-14	6303
7590	11/20/2009		EXAMINER	
Philip M. Weiss Weiss & Weiss 300 Old Country Road Suite 251 Mineola, NY 11501			DANG, HUNG XUAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2873	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/20/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/695,613	PAOLINO, LILLIAN R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HUNG X. DANG	2873	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/18/09.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-12 and 16-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 13-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC - 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Thayer et al (6,1 31,209) in view of Beames (D 466,543).

Thayer et al discloses eyewear comprises solid frames 60 having a lens; said frame 60 consisting of a one piece solid molded frame; said frames having a nose bridge which fits on top of a user's nose; said frames secured around a user's head by a single band 52; said band 52 secured to said frames 60 by two securing pieces wherein said band 52 is removed from said frame by either or both of said securing pieces wherein Velcro is used for both securing pieces; wherein said band 52 can be totally removed from said frames and replaced with other similar bands. (see at least figure 5 and the related disclosure.)

Thayer et al teach a single lens in the frame, Thayer et al does not teach that a pair of lenses as that claimed by Applicant.

Eyeglasses have long been designed with the general objective of correction the vision of the eye of the wears. Numerous designs of dual lens glasses and single lens glasses have been developed, differing only in aesthetic feature.

Beames, however, discloses the frames having a pair of lenses. Because Thayer et al and Beames are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose of aesthetic feature as disclosed by Beames would have been recognized as an art pertinent art of Thayer et al.

It would have been obvious, therefore, at the time the invention was made to a person having skill in the art to construct the eyeglasses frame, such as the one disclosed by Thayer et al, with a pair of lenses, such as disclosed by Beames for the purpose of the purpose of aesthetic feature.

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC - 103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Sadowsky (5,042,094).

Sadowsky discloses eyewear with prosthetic parts for small children comprises frame (30) for holding two lenses (20), the frame (the frame 30 is constructed with

resilient material, preferably also soft and pliable see column 3, lines 21 and 22) secured to a head by a band (40), said band (40) secured to the frames by two securing pieces (42) including Velcro is used for both securing pieces and the band (40) can be totally removed from the frame and replaced with other similar band (see figure 1 and the related disclosure.) Note that solid frame means the frame having the interior completely filled up and free from cavity, or not hollow.

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC - 102

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by **Laschober** (4,930,885).

Laschober discloses eyeglasses with releasable headband support arrangement comprises one piece solid molded frame (14) for holding two lenses (16), the frame (14) having a nose bridge (18) with fits on top of the user nose, the frame (14) secured to a head by a band (28), said band (28) secured to the frames by two securing pieces (30), wherein the band (28) is removed from the frame by either or both of the securing means (see figures .1-4 and the related disclosure.)

Response to Applicant's argument

Applicant's arguments filed 8/18/09 have been fully *considered* but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that "Thayer teaches a cleaning apparatus for eyewear, nowhere does it discuss sunglass." This argument is not persuasive because in line 3 of the Abstract of Thayer device clearly states that the device such as eyeglasses, sunglasses, goggle and the like. Therefore the claimed invention does not distinguish over the Thayer device.

Applicant argued that "Again, as previously stated, the cleaning apparatus is necessary and therefore, the "consisting of" language of the present claims cannot be taught by the present combination of Thayer and Beames. Accordingly, not only does the present invention and Thayer do not teach the same thing, but since the title of Beames is sunglasses, the same objective is not taught by Thayer and Beames. For these reasons, the above claims are not obvious over the prior art. " This argument is not persuasive because Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Applicant argued that "As previously stated, Sadowsky cannot anticipate or make obvious the claims of the present invention. The claims use "consisting of" language. Sadowsky specifically states that it teaches a specifically designed nose and temple pieces that are incorporated into the frame of the glasses. As stated previously, prosthetic appendages 34 and 36 must be included in Sadowsky. Therefore, the above claims are not anticipated or obvious over Sadowsky. "

This argument is not persuasive because in column 3, lines 19-21 of Sadowsky states "The frame 30 consists of rim 32, shaped like the perimeter of the lens 20, and of prosthetic appendages 34 and 36. The frame is constructed with resilient material, preferable also soft and pliable"

The prosthetic appendages 36 are parts of the frame, prosthetic appendages 36 and the frame is one piece (see column 3, lines 41 and 42).

In lines 51-53 of column 3 states that "Although not described in the figures, the lenses and the frame portions of the invention can also be produced in **a single piece**" and

Claim 3 of Sadowsky claimed that "the frame and the lens portion consist of a single structure made by plastic material"

Therefore the claimed invention does not distinguish over the Sadowsky device.

Furthermore, Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Applicant argued that "Laschober requires an attachment member adapted for releasable securement to a connector member. Since the claims require "consisting of" language, Laschober cannot anticipate or make obvious the claims." This argument is

not persuavie because Laschober device teaches every features of the claimed invention. Laschober discloses eyeglasses with releasable headband support arrangement comprises one piece solid molded frame (14) for holding two lenses (16), the frame (14) having a nose bridge (18) with fits on top of the user nose, the frame (14) secured to a head by a band (28), said band (28) secured to the frames by two securing pieces (30), wherein the band (28) is removed from the frame by either or both of the securing means (see figures 1-4 and the related disclosure.)

Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG X. DANG whose telephone number is (571)272-2326. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Mack, can be reached on 571-272-2333. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

11/09

/Hung X Dang/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2873